

One of the latest is a book by Mr. J. Swinburne, F.R.S. entitled "Population and the Social Problem." Mr. Swinburne is strongly opposed to socialism and to most of the follies of politicians and his main theory is that the troubles of mankind cannot be wiped out by any political devices as long as population increases so rapidly. Further, he rightly insists that most of the troubles of the poor are due to their own lack of self-restraint in the matter of child production. But he recognises that this is not a popular thing for politicians to say. He puts the point very clearly by referring to a supposed discussion among a community of rabbits:—

"One rabbit said: 'You are poor because you are prolific.' They would not have this at any price, so they reviled him and refused to listen, and said his theory had been disproved; for his explanation made out that the misery was really their own fault, and it is impossible to get an animal with the brain of a rabbit to realise that its troubles are due to its own faults."

Unfortunately not only do our politicians refrain from insisting on hard facts which cannot finally be evaded, but they are constantly directing their energies to encouraging the classes that ought to produce least to produce most. It has long been notorious that the poorest classes are the most reckless, not only in the matter of child production but in all the ways in which they regulate their lives. Probably the very fact of poverty makes prudence appear valueless. Mr. Swinburne puts this point very well.

"Finally we come down to the lowest classes of all. Here we have low wages or none. Irregular casual work, and pay to match; abject poverty, hopeless incompetence, and the maximum of misery. This is coupled with irresponsible multiplication of the lowest and worst types, and a high death-rate, especially of infants. To make matters worse, every effort is made to keep the worst and most miserable classes as large as possible by poor relief, 'charity,' and government protection."

If this policy be continued, and under present political conditions there seems every likelihood that it will be, the result must be a general lowering of the average standard of the whole community, and that in turn must finally mean a lowering of the capacity for wealth production and consequently a reduction of the available means of living. Mr. Swinburne lays stress on the fact that the socialists in the main ignore the population problem. It is however equally true that most members of the other political parties act in much the same manner. They find it politically unprofitable to tell the plain truth; and with the average politician that ends the matter.

HAROLD COX.

Wiggam, Albert Edward. *The New Decalogue of Science*. Indianapolis. The Bobbs Merrill Company. 1923. Pp. 314.

THIS Book is a vigorous attempt to popularize biological teaching with regard to the importance of heredity. It is couched in a somewhat original form and consists of five chapters entitled "The five warnings" and one called "The Ethical Transition." These are followed

by the "ten commandments of science," each of the first nine of which occupies a chapter, but the tenth commandment is discussed in three chapters. The book concludes with an epilogue consisting of an essay on "The Ethical Outlook" and a controversy with Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, in which it seems to us that Mr. Wiggam comes off second best.

The five warnings alluded are as follows: (1) that the advanced races are going backwards; (2) that heredity is the chief maker of men; (3) that the Golden Rule without science will wreck the race that tries it; (4) that Medicine, Hygiene and Sanitation will weaken the human race; (5) that Morals, Education, Art and Religion will not improve the human race. The Ethical Transition is the picturesque title chosen by Mr. Wiggam for the aphorism that the new fount of law, the modern Mount Sinai in fact, is the laboratory.

The ten commandments as enunciated by Mr. Wiggam may now be enumerated. They are (1) the duty of Eugenics; (2) the duty of scientific research; (3) the duty of the socialization of science; (4) the duty of measuring men; (5) the duty of humanizing industry; (6) the duty of preferential reproduction; (7) the duty of trusting intelligence; (8) the duty of art; (9) the duty of internationalism; (10) the duty of philosophical reconstruction.

With a great deal of what Mr. Wiggam says all Eugenists will find themselves in hearty agreement. In a country like America, where democracy is regarded with the same religious awe as was Holy Scripture by our grandfathers, he is indeed a bold man who fearlessly points out that all men are not born equal, that the proletariat fail to rise and to improve themselves not for lack of opportunity, but for lack of enterprise and inborn capacity, and that it is a suicidal policy to plunder the earnings of the competent in order to support the offspring of poor stock out of whom good citizens can never be developed.

Mr. Wiggam becomes sardonic on the type of representative chosen by a community in which all men are regarded as equal. He points out that the great and prosperous State of Minnesota was represented on the Senate by a gentleman whose only qualifications were that he owned a small farm and had a stentorian voice which enabled him to shout down all opponents.

Mr. Wiggam's remarks on the humanizing of industry are really profoundly interesting and illuminating. He remarks that if ever the clean, peaceful socialized commonwealth dreamed of by Mr. Wells could be realized it would provoke a revolution of such violence that the excesses of Bolshevism would seem like the proceedings of a Chatauqua Sunday School Convention in comparison. For as he truly says, what the soul of man craves for is not order, rule and safety, but excitement, risk and adventure, and it is the absence of these in modern industry that provokes much social unrest. The remedy would seem to be in piece-work and the sharing of the risks of the employer by the employees.

Nevertheless, Mr. Wiggam's book is characterised by the crudity which mars much American thought. He assumes that the final word on heredity has been spoken by Thomas Hunt Morgan, who is to him

the Moses of the new decalogue. He uses Lamarckism as a term of reproach. The proper study of man according to him is *Drosophila*. It would surprise Mr. Wiggam to be told that the central principle of Lamarckism has been shown to be true by at least four independent experimenters, that Morgan has only repeated and confirmed the findings of Mendel in the case of a small fly, all that is new in Morgan's work being of a highly speculative and imaginative character, and that so far from environment being without effect on heredity there is grave reason to suspect that the very "mutations" with which Morgan has worked owe their origin to the effects of a bad environment on the germ-cells. Nevertheless it is true that when a defective germ-cell has been once produced it tends to propagate itself with awful persistence, and Mr. Wiggam is right in saying that it should be prevented from so doing.

One is struck in reading Mr. Wiggam's book by the naive way in which he regards the American professors with whom he is familiar as leaders of the world's thought in their respective subjects. Many of their names are quite unknown on this side of the Atlantic and Mr. Wiggam is so badly acquainted with European biology that the only English biologist whom he mentions is Dr. Bateson.

But crude as are Mr. Wiggam's ideas on the subject of heredity, they are refinement itself compared with his views on physiology, psychology and philosophy. He accepts as his great and final prophet on these subjects John Broadus Watson, the "behaviourist" professor of psychology in Johns Hopkins University. This gentleman we are informed tells his students that "freedom of the will has been knocked into a cocked hat," and that "such things as the soul, consciousness, God, and immortality are merely mistakes of the older psychology." "Behaviourism" as expounded by Watson has been subjected to the most scathing analysis and destructive criticism by our own fellow-eugenicist, William McDougall, one of the leading psychologists of the world ; it is regarded, as we happen to know, as sheer lunacy by some of our foremost English philosophers. A characteristic American paragraph may be quoted : "Everett Dean Martin, Director of Cooper Union in New York City, who conducts the largest class of philosophy in the world, and *probably in the history of the world*, can not be classed as a mechanist. Yet he informs his students that religion is primarily a defence mechanism, a compensatory fiction for an inner feeling of inferiority, a device for importing symbols into a world of fact with the view of keeping up man's courage with a picture of a universe run in his private interest. Religious symbols such as salvation, the heavenly Father, angels, devils, etc., are different in degree but not in kind from the Freudian defence mechanisms of the paraniac."

Really, when one reads stuff like this, one begins to understand and partially to sympathise with the rise of "Fundamentalism" in America. After what we have already stated our readers will not be surprised to learn that we should regard the circulation of a book like Mr. Wiggam's in England as an unmixed calamity for the Eugenic cause. For whilst we are glad to welcome to our ranks those who feel compelled to adopt a mechanistic outlook upon life and on the universe

generally, we have to recognise that after all they only form a small minority of our fellow countrymen. As Sir Francis Galton, the founder of Eugenics clearly saw, the Eugenic idea of life will never prevail till it can enlist the sympathy of the vast majority of our countrymen whose views of life have a religious background, and he desired above all things to secure the co-operation of the more thoughtful religious leaders in the hope that in the future Eugenic practice would come to be regarded as religious duty. Nothing could do more to render such hopes futile than to create the impression that a belief in the necessity for eugenics was correlated with a materialistic view of man and the universe.

E. W. MACBRIDE.